

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re:  
City of Detroit, Michigan,  
Debtor.

---

Chapter 9  
Case No. 13-53846  
Hon. Steven W. Rhodes

**Order Granting In Part and Denying In Part  
Motion to Submit Additional Exhibits (Dkt. #7481)**

On September 15, 2014 creditor Wanda Jan Hill filed a motion to allow the submission of additional exhibits relating to her previously filed motion to participate in the plan confirmation hearing. Ms. Hill identifies the following additional “List of Exhibits and Supporting Description” in her motion:

1. Under the defined terms of the Disclosure Statements and the Plan of Adjustment documents, the “ASF Recoupment” definition refers to a “formulae set forth in Section II.B.3.r.ii.D”, albeit, the reductions of the ASF Savings Funds account and the monthly pension check. It is greatly assumed that the presentation of this formulae reveals the workings of the 6.75% interest rate. However, this aforementioned Section [Exhibit] is not found in court-honored documents. This lack of revealing this ‘stated’ information, relative to the 6.75% interest rate as a part of the ASF Recoupment amount, further supports this creditor’s non-disclosure concern. The exhibits are: 4391-1 (05-05-14); 4392 (05-05-14); 4394 (05-05-14); 6257 (07-25-14); and 6809 (08-20-14).
2. The exhibit is: U.S. Code Section 1123(a)(4) – A number of creditors under class 11 were not clearly, directly or reasonably made aware of the 6.75% interest rate amortized onto their Recoupment reduction information, which is tantamount to treatment disparity as a result of the absence of full disclosure. Therefore, because of this lack of clear and conspicuous information, especially prior to vote taking, it has muddied the waters and exposed the fact that some of the claims in Class 11 were not treated equally and were subject to the 6.75% rate, the interest rate of 6.75% was only germane to some, and for whatever reason, some creditors and their claims in Class 11 were not treated similarly because of the lack of a full-disclosure stance, and such treatment is not in accord with bankruptcy law.

(Dkt. #7481)

The Court finds cause to allow movant to submit for marking the additional exhibits identified in No. 1 above, 4391-1 (05-05-14); 4392 (05-05-14); 4394 (05-05-14); 6257 (07-25-

14); and 6809 (08-20-14). Accordingly, the motion is granted as to these exhibits and movant shall have until **September 26, 2014** to bring the exhibits to the court for marking in accordance with the procedure outlined in the Court's Order Regarding Motions to Participate in the Confirmation Hearing entered on August 20, 2014. (Dkt. #6896)

As to the request to submit the supplemental exhibit identified in No. 2 above, U.S. Code Section 1123(a)(4), the motion is denied.

**Signed on September 19, 2014**

/s/ Steven Rhodes  
**Steven Rhodes**  
**United States Bankruptcy Judge**